



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,960	06/04/2001	Kazuhiro Kudoh	00-169925	2545

21254 7590 08/25/2005  
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

GAUTHIER, GERALD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/871,960

Applicant(s)

KUDOH, KAZUHIRO

Examiner

Gerald Gauthier

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 30-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 and 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. **Claim(s) 9, 10 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

**Claim(s) 9, 10 and 13** are single means/steps claim(s). A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection. In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to Hyatt is possible, where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor.

**Claim(s) 14-24** are also rejected for being dependent of rejected **claim(s) 13**.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claim(s) 13-18 and 21-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henderson (US 6,611,681 B2).

Regarding **claim(s) 13**, Henderson discloses a communications terminal (column 4, lines 17-21) comprising:

a memory storing a character string for a calling party, the character string to be retrieved from the memory upon a receipt of a call from the calling party for outputting voice information (FIG. 1 and column 5, lines 52-59) and upon receipt of an instruction from a user during an incoming call (FIG. 1 and column 7, lines 4-9) [The transmission of audible caller identifying data to the telephone handset as a result of the called party pressing the talk button].

Regarding **claim(s) 14**, Henderson discloses a speaker (30 on FIG. 1); and

a controller that controls the speaker to output the voice information in response to a call from the calling party based upon the character string that was stored before the call from the party and upon receipt of the instruction (column 7, lines 4-9).

Regarding **claim(s) 15**, Henderson discloses a converter that converts the character string into an analog voice waveform (column 5, lines 52-59).

Regarding **claim(s) 16**, Henderson discloses a switch to receive the instruction and to control a retrieval of the character string and a conversion of the character string into an analog waveform (column 7, lines 4-9).

Regarding **claim(s) 17**, Henderson discloses a speaker in communication with the memory (column 5, lines 52-59).

Regarding **claim(s) 18**, Henderson discloses the controller determines whether the call is from the party based upon caller identification data (column 6, lines 31-39).

Regarding **claim(s) 21**, Henderson discloses the character string comprises a digitized voice signal (column 5, lines 52-59).

Regarding **claim(s) 22**, Henderson discloses the memory comprises a telephone directory that stores the character string (column 5, lines 52-59).

Regarding **claim(s) 23**, Henderson discloses the communications terminal comprises a mobile communications terminal (column 5, lines 60-63).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. **Claim(s) 1-12, 31 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennan (US 5,903,628) in view of Muramatsu (US 2001/0051536 A1) and in further view of Henderson.

Regarding **claim(s) 1, 6, 9 and 10**, Brennan discloses a mobile communications terminal device (FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-21), comprising:

storage means (Data Memory 42 on FIG. 1) for registering beforehand a name of an originator, one of the telephone number and a mail address of the originator, a kind of an incoming identification tone at a time of a call incoming from the originator and a character string input by the user and corresponding to a voice information designating the originator (column 4, lines 31-47);

control means (Main Controller 134 on FIG. 1) for controlling the voice output means to output the voice information corresponding to the character string registered beforehand in the storage means (column 4, lines 48-65).

Brennan discloses the user entering a plurality of telephone numbers and associated names and addressees into the memory prior receiving an incoming call (column 2, lines 45-59).

Note, recording an incoming identification tone to identify a caller is well known.

For example, Muramatsu, in the same field of endeavor, teaches a voice output means for ringing with the kind of the incoming identification tone corresponding to the originator at the time of the call incoming (§ 0033, § 0061).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brennan using the sounds patterns memory as taught by Muramatsu.

This modification of the invention would offer the capability of recording a sound pattern such as the system would allow the user to recognize whom is calling before the phone goes off-hook.

Brennan in combination with Muramatsu discloses reading the voice announcement recorded previously to announce the caller over the speaker to the called party but fails to disclose in response to an instruction received from said user while the voice output means is ringing.

However, Henderson, in the same field of endeavor, teaches in response to an instruction received from a user while the voice output means is ringing (FIG. 1 and column 7, lines 4-9).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brennan in combination with Muramatsu using the talk button as taught by Henderson.

This modification of the invention would offer the capability of announcing the caller so that the user would recognize whom is calling before the phone goes off-hook.

Regarding **claim(s) 2 and 7**, Brennan discloses the control means controls the voice output means to output the voice information after stopping the ringing in response to the instruction (column 3, lines 3-31).

Regarding **claim(s) 3 and 8**, Brennan discloses the control means controls the voice output means to output the voice information after reducing an output volume of ringing in response to the instruction (column 4, lines 48-65).



Regarding **claim(s) 4**, Muramatsu teaches the voice output means outputs the voice information corresponding to one of the telephone number and the mail address of the originator as the incoming identification tone at the time of the call incoming (¶ 0033).

Regarding **claim(s) 5**, Brennan discloses the voice output means outputs the primary information regarding one of the discriminating ringing and the originator as the voice information instead of the incoming identification tone (column 3, lines 3-31).

Regarding **claim(s) 11**, Brennan discloses the instruction comprises an input from a switch mounted on an exterior of the mobile communication terminal device (column 3, lines 3-31).

Regarding **claim(s) 12**, Brennan discloses the outputting of the voice information is in response to an external instruction during the ringing (column 4, lines 48-65).

Regarding **claim(s) 31**, Muramatsu teaches the mobile communications terminal device further comprising means for receiving said character string from the user (¶ 0061).

Regarding **claim(s) 32**, Muramatsu teaches the method comprising receiving said character string from the user before said ringing (¶ 0061).

8. **Claim(s) 19 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henderson as applied to **claim(s) 13 and 14** above, and further in view of Muramatsu.

Regarding **claim(s) 19**, Henderson as applied to **claim(s) 13** differs from **claim(s) 19** in that it fails to disclose the memory further stores a tone for the party.

However, Muramatsu, in the same field of endeavor, teaches the memory further stores a tone for the party (¶ 0033).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Henderson using the memory as taught by Muramatsu.

This modification of the invention would offer the capability of announcing the caller with a tone so that the user would recognize whom is calling before the phone goes off-hook.

Regarding **claim(s) 20**, Muramatsu teaches the controller controls the speaker to output the tone in response to a call from the party (¶ 0061).

9. **Claim(s) 24-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennan in view of Henderson.

Regarding **claim(s) 24**, Brennan discloses a method for identifying a caller in a mobile terminal (FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-21) comprising:

determining whether a memory includes a character string input by a user that corresponds to a caller (FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 48-51); and

outputting a voice signal that corresponds to said character string corresponds to said caller (FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 51-65).

Brennan discloses reading the voice announcement recorded previously to announce the caller over the speaker to the called party but fails to disclose in response to an instruction received from said user while the voice output means is ringing.

However, Henderson, in the same field of endeavor, teaches in response to an instruction from said user during an incoming call from the caller (FIG. 1 and column 7, lines 4-9).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brennan using the talk button as taught by Henderson.

This modification of the invention would offer the capability of announcing the caller so that the user would recognize whom is calling before the phone goes off-hook.

Regarding **claim(s) 25**, Brennan discloses receiving caller identification data and wherein the determining comprises determining whether the character string corresponds to the caller based upon the caller identification data (column 3, lines 3-31).

Regarding **claim(s) 26**, Brennan discloses storing the character string in a telephone directory before the determining (column 2, lines 45-59).

10. **Claim(s) 27, 28 and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brennan in view of Henderson as applied to **claim(s) 24 and 26** above, and further in view of Muramatsu.

Regarding **claim(s) 27**, Brennan in combination with Henderson as applied to **claim(s) 26** differs from **claim(s) 27** in that it fails to disclose outputting the tone if the tone corresponds to the caller before outputting the voice signal.

However, Muramatsu teaches storing a tone in the telephone directory (§ 0033); determining whether the tone corresponds to the caller (§ 0033); and outputting the tone if the tone corresponds to the caller before outputting the voice signal (§ 0061).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Brennan in combination with Henderson using the memory as taught by Muramatsu.

This modification of the invention would offer the capability of outputting the tone if the tone corresponds to the caller before outputting the voice signal so that the user would recognize whom is calling before the phone goes off-hook.

Regarding **claim(s) 28**, Muramatsu teaches initially running an identification tone in response to a call from the caller (§ 0061).

Regarding **claim(s) 30**, Muramatsu teaches the instruction comprises a prompt by a user for the output of the voice signal while an identification tone, corresponding to the caller, is ringing (§ 0061).

### ***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claim(s) 1-28 and 30-32** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald Gauthier whose telephone number is (571) 272-7539. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**GERALD GAUTHIER**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

Gerald Gauthier  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2645

g.g.

August 17, 2005